DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 304 484 TM 012 904

AUTHOR Clark, Paul A.; And Others
TITLE Improving Programs for the Preparation of Teaching through Program Evaluation.
PUB DATE Feb 88
NOTE 21p.; Part of the paper was presented at the Annual Meeting of the Eastern Educational Research Association (Miami Beach, FL, February 24-27, 1988). For a related document, see TM 012 848.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Standards; *Accreditation (Institutions); *Evaluation Methods; Formative Evaluation; Higher Education; *Preservice Teacher Education; *Program Evaluation; Program Improvement; Summative Evaluation; *Teacher Education Programs
IDENTIFIERS *Accreditation Plus Model; Tennessee

ABSTRACT

An objective of the Center for Teacher Education Evaluation (CTEE) at Tennessee Technological University (Cookeville) has been to create an evaluation model for teacher education to provide guidance for institutes of higher education. The model selected is the Accreditation Plus Model (APM). Steps covered in the model (or, steps an institution must follow to develop evaluation data) include: (1) selection of the level of accreditation desired; (2) initiation of a continuous evaluation process by collecting data related to the CTEE outline; (3) completion of the accreditation procedure, through use of data; (4) use of strategies collected from the various models to generate data for other purposes or to answer evaluative questions beyond those used by accrediting associations; and (5) use of Joint Committee Standards to evaluate the evaluation. A graphic presentation of the evaluation of the teacher education model is appended, which includes the following components: student growth outcomes; requirements of teacher education candidates; elements of teacher education programs; application of the APM; application of the Joint Committee Standards for Evaluation; evaluation beyond accreditation; and summative and formative evaluations. (TJH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED304484

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

PAUL A. CLARK

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

IMPROVING PROGRAMS FOR THE PREPARATION OF TEACHING THROUGH PROGRAM EVALUATION

Paul A. Clark, Jerry B. Ayers & William J. Gephart
Center for Teacher Education Evaluation
Tennessee Technological University
Cookeville, TN 38505

TM012904

IMPROVING PROGRAMS FOR THE PREPARATION OF TEACHING THROUGH PROGRAM EVALUATION[1]

Paul A. Clark,[2] Jerry B. Ayers and William J. Gephart
Center for Teacher Education Evaluation
Tennessee Technological University
Cookeville, TN 38505

An objective of the Center for Teacher Education Evaluation (CTEE) has been to create an evaluation model for teacher education. This model would guide all kinds and sizes of colleges and universities to systemize and to be thorough in their evaluation process so that educational decisions for improvement and change can be made wisely. The model would be flexible enough so that the specific evaluation needs of each institution could be included. It would be complete enough to include the best thinking and strategies of teacher education evaluators up until this time.

BACKGROUND

The literature describes the need for more systematic evaluation. Gage (1972) noted that pre-service educational programs have failed to gather empirical evidence which would yield acceptable evaluation. NCATE's mandate for systematic evaluation and the considerable research on teacher education evaluation have not changed general practice in evaluation the sixteen years after Gage's assessment.

Careful study of the descriptions of good evaluation in literature has caused the CTEE staff to synthesize many excellent suggestions into seven necessary components of a good model. (Dillion and Starkman, 1981; Galluzzo, 1981; Nelli and Nutter, 1985; Stufflebeam, 1982; Soar, 1978; Coker, Lorentz and Medley, 1976; Gardner, 1983; Yarger and Galluzzo, 1983; Katz and Raths, 1985; Zempher and Ashburn, 1985). These components, which have become the basic organizers of the CTEE evaluation model, are: 1) candidates for admission to teacher education programs; 2) the program for the preparation of teachers; 3) staff of the program;

---

[1]Present in part before the Eastern Education Research Association Meeting, Miami, FL, February, 1988. The work reported herein was supported in part by a grant from the State of Tennessee through the Tennessee Higher Education Commission.

[2]On leave of absence during 1987-88 from Milligan College, Milligan College, Tennessee

TM012904

4) teacher candidate outcome assessment; 5) the educational unit; 6) follow-up of the graduates of a teacher education program; and 7) pupil outcomes (growth of the pupils of the graduates).

There is some concern that too many models already exist (Gephart, 1976 and Ayers, Gephart and Clark, 1987). Gephart has bibliographic references to over thirty-nine evaluation models. The CTEE staff sought some approach which would not be just another model. Rather, they sought an evaluative approach that would synthesize and enhance existing models.

Their interest moved to the accreditation model which has been in existence since 1845 in Boston. It was recognized again in 1895 and was more fully developed in the 1930's (Madaus, Scriven, Stufflebeam, 1983). Worthen and Sanders (1973), House (1983), and Stake (1983) all discuss the accreditation model.

Ayers (1986) has a history of experience with teacher education models. He developed a model at Tennessee Technological University in 1973 based on Sandefur's (1970) teacher education follow-up evaluation plan. The major focus of this model was on follow-up studies of graduates and ways to improve programs based on empirical evidence. The University was recently cited by the American Association of State College and Universities for its work in teacher education evaluation.

In 1984 the Tennessee State Legislature passed the Comprehensive Education Reform Act which authorized the establishment of Centers of Excellence in Tennessee universities designed to improve the economic, cultural, and social opportunities available to the citizens of Tennessee. Tennessee Technological University developed a proposal for the creation of a Center of Excellence on Teacher Education Evaluation. The Center for Teacher Education Evaluation (CTEE) began operation on July 1, 1986. Its goals were:

1. Contribute to the continual improvement of teacher education programs through the systematic development and testing of teacher education evaluation models.

2. Further research in the area of teacher education program evaluation.

3. Establish improved delivery systems for information about teacher education program evaluation.

Given those goals, one of the Center's initial tasks was the evaluation model to be used in the Center's work. As stated earlier, over 39 evaluation models, approaches, or forms have been identified in professional education's knowledge base. Given

that plethora of evaluation models, the Center staff itself undertook an evaluation. Which extant evaluation model or combination thereof were most appropriate for the Center's work?

The first steps of that evaluation were the delineation of the "dimensions of worth." This is appropriate when the entities being evaluated are evaluation approaches themselves. Those dimensions of worth were:

1. Completeness vs. partiality
2. Age and history
3. Maturity vs. immaturity
4. Isomorphic vs. analogous modeling
5. Model specificity vs. generality

Item 1 needs no further elaboration. Age and history are two factors related but different. It is assumed that vingage stuff has to be old. History has a slightly different character. As an evaluation model ages, other events occur - events that strengthen (or weaken) a model. Maturity or immaturity seem again to be age related but, again, not totally. The most immature models are simple verbal representations - collections of words that convey what we mean by a thing being modeled. As models mature, they take on different overall characteristics. For example, consider the model of the aerodynamics concept, "Lift." Modeling that construct starts with the organization of words that represent the phenomenon lift. Next comes the use of vectors to define lift, followed by the physical model, the wind tunnel, and mathematatical and computer modeling. Isomorphic modeling occurs when there is a one-for-one relationship between the thing modeled and the thing. Analogous models have identifies in inputs and outputs but likely have variation for their process aspects. Finally, some models are specific. For example, in this project we search for an evaluation approach focused on teacher education evaluation. In contrast, a summative evaluation model has great generalizability. But that breadth is often an impedement to the performance of project specific work.

When those dimensions of worth were applied, the accreditation model had the greater worth. The 1986 version of the accreditation model appears to be almost complete. It has all the extant models beat on the age and history dimensions. References to and instances of the accreditation model can be found prior to the 1890s. People at the University of Michigan wanted a way to evaluate secondary education programs to help the university's matriculation decision. Finally, model maturity: Simple numerical analysis drove the evaluation in the earlier days from the 1890s to the 1930s. At that point, the North Central Association of Secondary Schools and Colleges was joined with six other regional accreditation bodies across the nation.

> Since then (the 1930s) the accreditation movement has expanded tremendously and gained great strength and credibility as a major means of evaluating the adequacy of education institutions." (p.6)

The Center has selected a model, a first step. The model, entitled Accreditation Plus, is a variation of the accreditation approach to program evaluation. The Model is designed to assist colleges and universities systemize and more frequently collect the data needed for accreditation and to provide evaluation strategies for institutions which wish to gather evaluation data beyond that which is required for accreditation. The CTEE staff is currently conducting an inventory of existing tools and procedures and is developing others so that field trials of the Model will begin during the year.

THE ACCREDITATION PLUS MODEL

The Accreditation Plus Model began with a set of assumptions. Those assumptions are focused on accreditation as carried out by NCATE and the state approval process. This is acknowledged by the Center staff. Teacher education improvement is the Center's overall mission. Accreditation aimed directly at teacher education is our primary concern. Accreditation that focuses on a university's total mission is of secondary concern.

List of Assumptions

1. Accreditation as it is now practiced is a passive process. It is done at the direction of the accrediting association. Part of an evaluation program should be an active, continuous, formative process.

2. The handbooks of the different accrediting bodies are thorough and designed to encourage the evaluation process. A continuous evaluation process should produce the data needed to complete the accreditation reports.

3. If fully employed in the design and operation of a professional education unit, the NCATE standards, policies, and procedures will guide the development of a quality teacher education program.

4. Thorough attention to and compliance with NCATE's eleven preconditions, the compiling and filing of specified annual reports, the preparation of a serious and thorough self-study, and a carefully conducted site visit will provide an abundance of data on which a teacher education unit can base continual changes and improvement.

5. This more active evaluation process should produce a more useful and higher quality evaluation which may cause the unit to reach out for information beyond the usual accreditation report.

6. The subtle, unwritten policy that bigger programs are better is not the position of the CTEE. The Accreditation Plus Model will be designed to be helpful to serious colleges, both small and large, who want to plan change and improvement as a part of their mission.

7. The atmosphere of accreditation is, but should not be, that of a crisis. Threat is detrimental to productive change. The individuals and agencies who direct accreditation should take all the necessary steps to change that climate. Accreditation can, and should, be a team affair, a force for the future, not a spectre from the past.

Accreditation, as an evaluation model, has a long and continuous history. It is a true form of evaluation in that it assesses the worth of a college or university's program and personnel to determine whether they are meeting standards and ways to improve. Since the accreditation handbooks (state, regional, and national) are evaluation criteria required for proper college and university recognition, the CTEE staff proposes use of the accreditation process as the nucleus of its evaluation model.

A graphic presentation of Accreditaton Plus, along with a more detailed outline of the components and operation, is an appendix to this paper. This presentation begins with Pupil Growth Outcomes and continues through Teacher Candidate Outcomes to the rest of the components.

Another way to present Accreditation Plus is to anticipate the steps an institution must follow to develop evaluation data. These steps are: Step 1. Select the level of accreditation desired; Step 2. Begin a continuous evaluation process by collecting data related to the CTEE outline; Step 3. Complete the accreditation procedure; Step 4. Use strategies collected from the various models to generate data for other purposes or to answer evaluative questions beyond those used by accrediting associations; Step 5. Use Joint Committee Standards to evaluate the evaluation. A graphic presentation of this approach is shown in Figure 1.

Step 1. Selecting an Accreditation Level

Organizations at three different levels control the accreditation operations and processes. At the national level NCATE evaluates the professional education unit that is responsible for the preparation of Preschool-12 professional educators. Currently

NCATE standards address five categories: I. Knowledge base; II. Relationship to the world of practice; III. Students; IV. Faculty; and V. Governance and resources. These five are in turn divided into 18 standards, for which there are 94 documentary criteria. In redesigning the process in 1986 eleven preconditions were added to the mix.

There are six regional accreditation agencies - each with a geographic area, its own set of standards, its own accreditation policies and approach. NCATE regards regional accreditation as assurance of an overall institutional quality and thus requires it as an NCATE precondition.

State approval is a governmental activity that requires all professional education programs in a state to meet standards of quality to be eligible for state certification. In states with state approval systems, state approval is considered an NCATE precondition.

There are a number of "Learned Societies" in the unit's environment. They typically have the same goal as found in national, regional, and state agencies but their focus and activities are subject matter oriented. Their participation in the NCATE Redesign has given them a greater role in accreditation.

Step 2. Beginning a Continuous Evaluation Process

The heart of Accreditation Plus is the list of categories of teacher education data which will be gathered. Colleges and universities should use this list to organize their evaluation data. The CTEE staff is preparing evaluation questions and strategies organized under these seven headings to help in the gathering of evaluation data as a part of Accreditation Plus. The seven categories are listed below with some discussion of the data involved in this component.

Candidate selection. Careful selection of teacher education candidates can be most important to the quality of teachers who graduate. This is not a simple problem. College leaders are concerned that they chose teacher education students from the population of students they ordinarily serve. Minorities should be chosen so that they can be well represented in the future teaching profession. Reformers argue that only persons with high standardized test scores can be effective teachers. Colleges must analyze their practices and collect descriptive data related to candidate selection.

Program. The college's efforts to change the candidates to become competent teachers is largely effected through the program. The program is complex, including the social climate, curriculum, counselling and advising, library and media opportunities, and practicum experiences. NCATE standards speak to this component

in two major sections - Knowledge Base for Professional Education and Relationship to the World of Practice.

Staff. The staff's qualifications, planning, instruction strategies, professional associations, scholarly productions, and ability to supervise practicum activities are all important to the teacher education program. Strategies to probe the quality of the staff are a part of Accreditation Plus.

Candidate outcomes. Graduates will have earned a degree with a major (endorsement area) in a specialty area which will provide the content of the graduate's teaching. Another large part of the curriculum is the liberal arts or general education group of courses. Professional education courses to be completed include the covering of topics in theory, principles, methods, and procedures for teaching. The candidate will have finished a series of carefully monitored field experiences. Usually these achievements result in acceptable standardized test scores and beginning competencies necessary for effective teaching. At any rate, the graduate with this curriculum is awarded a certificate and pronounced safe to practice.

Educational unit. The organization of administration and faculty to deliver the teacher education program is called a unit. This may be a college, a division, a department or a cross-campus faculty group who feel a responsibility to one another and to students for the planned change of the candidates into teachers. There should be an administrator recognized by the entire institution and by the unit as the one who presides over the teacher education unit.

Follow-up. The college conducts studies of the graduate's effectiveness as a teacher at designated periods after the graduate has been employed as a teacher. This has been the focus of Tennessee Tech's award winning teacher education evaluation model.

Pupil outcomes. The teacher who has completed the program should lead pupils to growth in academic knowledge; in physical, social and emotional domains; in basic skills, including language and mathematics; in learning how to learn; and in the development of skills to become productive citizens.

Step III. Using Data to Achieve and to Maintain Accreditation

Since the process of Step II has become a formative process, institution staffs should be able, after completing it ,to use this data to make decisions to create a better program. Data for various annual reports should be available from one unified source. Accreditation should no longer be a crisis activity.

The data should be available in the continuously developed evaluation process of Step 2 to be lifted into the accreditation self-study.

There are seven elements to the accreditation process operation. They are: 1) a handbook of standards, policies, and procedures; 2) a self-study that documents the degree a professional education unit is in compliance with the 18 NCATE standards; 3) the creation of a team of experts; 4) a site visit to assess the validity of the self-study; 5) a report on the unit; 6) review by a panel; and 7) a final report and decision.

The self-study is no longer a passive product prepared as an end in itself for an external group. It becomes an internal feedback system prepared by persons with more experience in evaluation. Visiting teams continue to be useful for evaluative expertise and objective approach to the evaluation process. But they become consultants less interested in finding huge gaps in the program and more interested in dialoging about variations in approaches and possible future growth. The whole process of seeking and continuing accreditation should become a higher level evaluation activity which should grow into a well established research and development component of every college and university.

Step IV. Using Evaluation Strategies Beyond Accreditation

As insitutions become more comfortable with the evaluation process, they may raise evaluation questions beyond those of the accreditation process. This is where the Plus of Accreditation Plus begins. This is the time to turn to the thirty-nine or so evaluation models for evaluation tools and techniques which could meet the special needs of institutions. The CTEE staff recommends an informed eclecticism.

Several writers on evaluation models have suggested that we have clusters of evaluation models, not 39 (and climbing) models. There are a number of these models that are systemic models; they are descriptive of the evaluation and the setting within which exists and makes a contribution. A second category encompasses those structured by the legal metaphor. Still another cluster appears to be a set of clinical models shaped by phenomonology and the primacy of the client's perception of his world and his own needs.

The multiplicity of evaluation models is more confusing than helpful. In the work that has germinated this proliferation, we have learned a lot about evaluation tools, methods, and techniques. A decade ago Worthen and Sanders argued for eclectic evaluation design: we'll use component X from Joe Jones' model, component M from the groups at Long Pond. All too often that produces a crony eclecticism. We know enough about the collection of tools and techniques that we can construct "informed

eclectic evaluation" designs. The evaluation of X over at Y had the same or about the same sampling problem as we have so we'll use that sampling technique; or, in the study at that place in Indiana, the measurement task was very similar to ours. An Informed Eclecticism is one that picks a technique because it satisfies an investigative need.

Step V. Evaluating the Evaluation

An important step for the institution is the development of meta-evaluation skills. This development can become a reality as the institution uses the Joint Committee Standards to evaluate the evaluation.

REFINEMENT PROCESS

The CTEE continues to develop Accreditation by conducting an inventory of proven tools and procedures which will be useful to Accreditation Plus. We are planning field trials of the Model during this year. In the meantime, input into the refinement process is most welcome.

References

Ayers, J. B. (1986). Proposal for the establishment of a center of excellence in teacher education evaluation at Tennessee Technological University (Revised). Cookeville, TN: Tennessee Technological University, College of Education.

Ayers, J. B., Gephart, W. J. and Clark, P. A. (1987). The accreditation plus model. Unpublished manuscript, Cookeville, TN: Tennessee Tecyhnological University, Center for Teacher Education Evaluation.

Coker, H., Lorentz, J. L. and Medley, D. M. (1976). Implications for teacher education derived from the west Georgia competency based teacher certification project. Unpublished manuscript, Carrollton, GA: West Georgia College.

Dillon, J. T., and Starkman, S. S. (1981). A "model" approach to evaluation of teacher education programs. Education, 101(4), 366-371.

Gage, N. L., (1972). Teacher effectiveness and teacher evaluation: the search for a scientific basis. Palo Alto, CA: Pacific Books.

Galluzo, G. R. (1981). Program evaluation in teacher education: From admissions through follow-up. In S. M. Hord, T. V. Savage, and L. J. Bethel (Eds.), Toward usable strategies for teacher education program evaluation. Austin, TX: The University of Texas, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.

Gardner, W. E. (1983). A final note: synthesis and reflections. In K. R. Howey and W. E. Gardner (Eds.), The education of teachers - A look ahead. New York: Longman.

Gephart, W. J. 1976). We have reached a point of absurdity! The Ceds Quarterly, 9(2),2.

House, E. R. (1983). Assumptions underlying evaluation models. In G. F. Madaus, M. S. Scriven, and D. L. Stufflebeam (Eds.), Evaluation models. Boston: Kluwer-Nyhoff Publishing.

Katz, L. & Raths, J. (1985). A framework for research on teacher education programs. Journal of Teacher Education, 36, 9-15.

Madaus, G. F., Scriven, M., and Stufflebeam, D. L. 1983). Evaluation models. Bosten: Kluever-Nyhoff Publishing.

Nelli, E. & Nutter, N. (1985). A model for evaluating teacher education programs. Washington: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education

Sandefur, J. T. (1970). An illustrated model for the evaluation of teacher education graduates. Washington: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

Soar, R. S. (1978). Models for evaluating teacher effectiveness. In the Ohio Study Council for Research and Evaluation in Teacher Education, Proceedings of the fall 1978 conference - strategies for evaluation of teacher education. Columbus, OH: State of Ohio Department of Education.

Stake, R. E. (1983). Program evaluation, particularly responsive evaluation. In G. F. Madaus, M. S. Scriven, and D. L. Stufflebeam (Eds.), Evaluation models. Boston: Kluwer-Nyhoff Publishing.

Stufflebeam, D. L. (1982). Exploration in the evaluation of teacher education. In S. M. Hord, T. V. Savage and L. J. Bethel Development Center for Teacher Education.

Worthen, B. R., and Sanders, J. R. 1973). Education evaluation: Theory and practice. Worthington, Ohio: Charles A. Jones.

Yarger, S. J., and Galluzo, G. R. 1983). Toward solving the dilemnas of research on inservice teacher education. In K. R. Howey and W. E. Gardner (Eds.), The education of teachers - A look ahead. New York: Longman.

Zimpher, N. L., and Ashburn, E. A. 1985). Studying the professional development of teachers: How conceptions of the world inform the research agenda. Journal of Teacher Education, 36(6), 16-26.

The ACCREDITATION PLUS MODEL

We start with a TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAM (4)

- ☐ a new one
- ☐ a developing one

That carries a MANDATE -- thou shalt be ACCREDITED! (4.1)

Apply: the ACCREDITATION PLUS MODEL

(4.2) First, know the accreditation agencies

(4.3)

Accreditation Levels	National	State	Regional
National (N)	N	NS	NR
State (S)		S	SR
Regional (R)			R

(4.4)

I Select the Level(s) of accreditation sought

II List the evaluative questions that structure the accreditation at the selected level(s)

III Establish data generation and reporting procedures

IV Plan for improvement and change

(4.5) Accreditation Process: Handbook on standards, Self Study, Team of experts, Site visit, Report on Unit, Review by panel, Report on decision

(3.) Teacher Education Program Elements

1) Candidate selection
2) Program
3) Staff
4) Candidate outcomes
5) Educational unit
6) Follow-up
7) Pupil outcomes

An evaluation of the TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAM (2.)

The CANDIDATE will have:

A) Earned a major in a [illegible] area of study (e.g., English, history, computer science, etc.
B) Attained a liberal arts education.
C) Mastered education theory, principles, methods, and practices.
D) Perform up to standards on a set of [illegible] skill competencies
And, obtained a provisional license (safe to practice)

The ultimate criteria

PUPIL GROWTH OUTCOMES (1.)

a) Academic growth
b) Personal, social, and emotional growth
c) Mastered skills -- learning skills
d) Mathematical literacy
e) Learn how to learn
f) Development of productive citizenry

PLUS (6.)

Additional Evaluative Needs
- one time needs
- on-going evaluation needs

(6.1) RESOURCES --- Checklists of extant evaluation models

Systems Models, Goal Based Models, Process Models, Decision Making Models, Naturalistic/Ethnographic Models, etc.
Also, process evaluation tools

ECLECTIC EVALUATION DESIGNS

(6.2) Informed eclecticism

(7.2) Formative

(7.1) Summative

EVALUATION of the EVALUATION --- the Joint Committee Standards (5.)

(6.3)

ACCREDITATION

Updated Jan, 1996

THE ACCREDITATION PLUS MODEL

Enclosed as page 12 in these materials is a graphic presentation of the A-PLUS Model. It presents the components of the model and suggests their general relationships. (Concurrent with this writing Center Staffers are developing flow charts that will show the work to be done in an application of ACCREDITATION PLUS.)

The sequence of presentation of the components below contains little consequence. The ACCREDITATION PLUS model has been presented to numerous audiences. Each started with a different component. There is some logic for starting on the Ultimate Criteria (#1) and the Second Ultimate Criteria(#2)--Pupil Growth Outcomes and Teacher Candidate Outcomes.

The components of The ACCREDITATION PLUS Model are as follows:

1. **Pupil Growth Outcomes.** The focus here is on the elementary and secondary school students who will be taught by the next class of beginning teachers. We expect pupil growth in

   1.1 Academic areas

   1.2 Physical, social, and emotional domains

   1.3 Language arts--reading, writing, speaking, and listening skills

   1.4 Skills in mathematical problem solving

1.6 Development of the skills needed to become productive citizens.

2. **Teacher education candidates** will have satisfactorily

2.1 Earned a major in an area of specialty of the particular college or university

2.1.1 Such as physics, mathematics, history, home economics, etc. (for future secondary teachers)

2.1.2 For elementary education candidates a major in language arts sets here.

2.2 Completed the sequence of courses that defines the particular school's liberal (or general) education

2.3 Completed courses on

2.3.1 Educational theory, principles, methods, and procedures for teaching

2.4 Completed a carefully monitored set of field experiences

2.4.1 Starting with learning to observe and measure teaching using several measurement systems

2.4.2 Progressing through roles of teacher aid, tutor, supervised teaching, and beginning teacher.

2.5 Attained a provisional teaching certificate.

3. It moves next to the elements of **teacher education programs.**

3.1 Teacher education candidates.

3.2 Those candidates will work through a program defined by the staff as the courses and experiences that qualify the teacher to graduate and to receive provisionsal certification to teach

3.3 A staff whose academic background prepares them to conduct courses as prescribed by the educational unit policy and regulating personnel.

3.4 Candidate outcomes (See component 2.1-2.5).

3.5 An educational unit---the administrative and subject matter home of members of the staff.

3.6 Follow-up--the studies engaged in to determine the program's quality, and changes in the program that need exploring.

3.7 Pupil outcomes (See component 1.1-1.6).

4. An application of the ACCREDITATION PLUS Model starts with either a new or a continuing teacher education program.

4.1 It starts with a mandate--thou shalt be accredited,

4.2 Calls for expanded knowledge about the accreditation process and agencies.

4.2.1 There are four levels of accreditation:

4.2.1.1 The National level (NCATE),

4.2.1.2 State accreditation agencies some of which are related with the National agencies.

4.2.1.3 Regional agencies--Seven agencies that assess program quality and which focus on the total scope of a school's offerings.

4.2.1.4 Local agencies. There are some places in which accreditation by local agencies is required before permission to function is granted.

4.3 There are other indirect accreditation approval agencies, i.e., NASDTEC, COPA.

4.4 A decision is made here, a choice of level or combination of levels is selected for the evaluation.

4.5 The conduct of the self-study including the development of the evaluation program, and field testing it.

4.5.1 Listing the level(s) of accreditation sought.

4.5.2 Listing the evaluative questions that make up the evaluation.

4.5.3 Establish data generation, analysis, interpretation, and reporting procedure;

4.5.4 Planning for improvement and change.

4.6 The general elements of an accreditation effort:

4.6.1 A handbook of standards,

4.6.2 A self-study,

4.6.3 A team of external assessors,

4.6.4 A site visit,

4.6.5 A report on the institution,

4.6.6 Review by a panel of experts,

4.6.7 Final report and decision.

5. **Application of the Joint Committee Evaluation Standards** to the evaluation plans and procedures.

6. If the teacher education unit is satisfied with accreditation compliance only, the planning is finished. If there is a need and desire for evaluation beyond the accreditation compliance, an additional set of evaluation plans will be drawn up to provide the needed evaluation findings.

6.1 Categories of evaluation models are listed as resources and/or reminders of the extent of our knowledge about the evaluation process.

6.2 Eclecticism in the design of the evaluation procedures is urged. (We know a lot about measuring techniques, about the objectives attended to, about sampling procedures, etc. We should apply informed eclecticism in choosing proven techniques and procedures for the PLUS side of ACCREDITATION PLUS.

6.3 Again, the Joint Committee standards for program evaluation will be used to assess the quality of the selected techniques, tools, and tactics.

7. There are two general evaluative approaches:

7.1 Summative evaluation used to inform decisions about the relative quality of program options.

7.1.1 decisions about competing products

7.1.2 staffing decisions about assignment, promotion, retention, and dismissal

7.1.3 summative evaluation is usually done by someone to something or someone

7.2 Formative evaluation used to inform decisions about how a program, a product, or a staff performance can be improved.

7.2.1 Formative evaluation is a process to be used by the personnel seeking to improve performance.

7.2.2 Formative evaluation is designed and conducted by the staff member seeking improvement in performance.

SUMMARY

Evaluation of teacher education became a major thrust of a Center for Excellence in teacher education when the Tennessee Higher Education Commission (THEC) established the project in 1986. A major accomplishment in the project was realized when the ACCREDITATION PLUS Model was amalgamated for the project's evaluation approach. A-PLUS! Thorough study of existing evaluation approaches were convincing. No one approach seemed capable of doing the task. At the same time it seems ludicrous to create a new evaluation approach to add to the existing forty or so models.

As an evaluation form, Accreditation Plus has a long history. It goes back to 1895 when staff members of the University of Michigan tried to determine the quality of secondary schools to determine whose graduates ought to be readily admitted into the University of Michigan. At the start (in the late 1890's), accreditation focused on program evaluation. The evaluation need in the work of the Center

for Teacher Education Evaluation was the same--the quality assessment of education programs.

The idea of eclecticism moves in the same general direction. By recognition that accreditation is not the be all and end all in evaluating teacher education programs, the Center keeps open the use of any/or all the existing models in an application of the ACCREDITATION PLUS Model. Eclecticism means: selecting what appears to be the best in various doctrines, methods, or styles. It also means: composed of elements drawn from the various sources. In selecting A-PLUS as the evaluation approach for the project, we capitalize on a long and effective history supplimented by the best of the current crop.

The diagram presented above is a representation of evaluation of teacher education a la the accreditation approach. It describes the model's components and in some places, the relationships of those elements. The Center's staff is working to further detail the elements of the accreditation approach to evaluation. Questions and comments are welcomed as we move further with this work.